

# The Classical Weekly

Published on Monday, October 1 to May 31, except in weeks in which there is a legal or school holiday (Columbus Day, Election Day, Thanksgiving Day, Christmas, New Year's Day, Lincoln's Birthday, Washington's Birthday, Easter Sunday, Decoration Day). A volume usually contains twenty-six or twenty-seven issues.

Owner and Publisher, The Classical Association of the Atlantic States.  
Place of publication, Barnard College, New York, New York.  
Editor, Charles Knapp (Barnard College, Columbia University).  
Address, 1737 Sedgwick Avenue, New York, New York.

VOLUME XXIX, No. 6

MONDAY, DECEMBER 2, 1935

WHOLE NO. 778

## HAWTHORNE'S DEBT TO CLASSICAL LITERARY CRITICISM

It is a commonplace of literary criticism that, the more consummate an artist's work is, the more will it appear to be *sui generis*; the higher a man ranks as a creative writer, the less will he show the roots from which his artistry springs. To this rule Hawthorne is no exception. His works are not studded with quotations from other authors or in foreign languages, as are those of his contemporary Poe and his classmate Longfellow. It is difficult to find in the stories which he wrote even echoes of the works that he had read. However, without arriving at certainty concerning the literary forces that were at work upon Hawthorne, through the examination of other sources of information that supplement his own works one can discover some of the influences to which he had been subjected, and sufficient evidence can be accumulated to justify, as at least highly probable, the conclusion that these sources were powerful aids in his writing.

This paper will consider the debt of Hawthorne to classical literary criticism, chiefly as set forth by Horace.

Longfellow, who was Hawthorne's classmate at Bowdoin, wrote to his father during his College career that he was reading Horace and finding it most enjoyable<sup>1</sup>. In those days prior to the invention of any elective system, Hawthorne must have read Horace in the same class with Longfellow. There is evidence, too, that Hawthorne showed remarkable facility in Latin composition while he was in College<sup>2</sup>. This is true in spite of Hawthorne's statement in later years that he was an idle student at Bowdoin, uninterested in the curriculum and not amenable to discipline<sup>3</sup>. His son-in-law mentions "the preference always noticeable in Hawthorne for Latin wording"<sup>4</sup>, which, though it was in part the result, doubtless, of his early reading in Milton and in Pope, could not fail to have been caused also by his facility in Latin. Lathrop sums up the matter in the following words<sup>5</sup>:

... Hawthorne held eminent scholarship easily within his grasp, but he and his two cronies <Longfellow and Pierce?> seem to have taken their curriculum very easily, though they all came off well in the graduation. Hawthorne was a good Latinist. ... Mr. Longfellow tells me that he recalls the graceful and poetic translations which his classmate used to give from the Ro-

man authors. He got no celebrity in Greek, I believe but he always kept up his liking for the Latin writers ....

Whether he kept up constantly his liking for Latin writers by actual perusal of them cannot be proved. Another biographer implies that French was the only foreign language to which Hawthorne devoted much attention in after years<sup>6</sup>. His interest in classical literature, at least in classic legend, is amply attested by his collections *Tanglewood Tales* and *A Wonder Book*, but he may have read in translations the material for these works.

The attempt to study Hawthorne's relations with classical literature must not omit to mention the strong influence exerted by Mrs. Hawthorne. Her son writes of her<sup>7</sup>:

... Her learning and accomplishments were rare and varied. ... She read Latin, Greek, and Hebrew; she was familiar with history; and in drawing, painting, and sculpture she showed a loving talent not far removed from original genius. Thus she was able to meet at all points her husband's meditative and theoretic needs with substantial and practical gratification. ...

For a man who had himself read every book in the Athenaeum Library in Salem<sup>8</sup> the aid bestowed by one so gifted in the very fields in which he was himself deficient—he lacked, in particular, understanding and appreciation of the plastic arts—was a great boon. There is a possibility, too, that Hawthorne's comparative ignorance of Greek may have been supplemented by his wife's greater knowledge of the language, and that through her reading, which she records in her *Journal*<sup>9</sup>, of Addison's criticism of *Paradise Lost* she may have become acquainted at second-hand with some of the principles of Aristotle's *Poetics*. The classical tradition of literary criticism was kept alive also by Hawthorne's sister Elizabeth, who admired Pope<sup>10</sup>. In evaluating Hawthorne's debt to the Classics in the works produced by him after his marriage it is not possible to discern whether the influence came through his own preparation or through that of Mrs. Hawthorne.

Strangely enough, Hawthorne's Note-Books, which might be expected to throw a great deal of light upon his reading, are totally silent in this respect. They are simply collections of incidents and ideas to be considered as possible material for later tales. It would even seem as if he intentionally excludes literary ob-

<sup>1</sup>Samuel Longfellow, Henry Wadsworth Longfellow, 1.49 (Boston, Ticknor and Co., 1882).

<sup>2</sup>James T. Fields, *Yesterdays With Authors*, 46 (Boston, James R. Osgood, 1872).

<sup>3</sup>Julian Hawthorne, *Nathaniel Hawthorne and his Wife*, 1.96 (2 volumes. Boston, Houghton Mifflin, 1895).

<sup>4</sup>George Parsons Lathrop, *A Study of Hawthorne*, 132 (Boston, Houghton Mifflin, 1893).

<sup>5</sup>*Ibidem*, 111.

<sup>6</sup>George Edward Woodberry, *Nathaniel Hawthorne*, 152 (Boston, Houghton Mifflin, 1902).

<sup>7</sup>Julian Hawthorne, *Nathaniel Hawthorne and His Wife*, 1.40-41. Compare Woodberry, *Nathaniel Hawthorne*, 83.

<sup>8</sup>James T. Fields, *Yesterdays With Authors*, 47 (see note 2, above).

<sup>9</sup>Julian Hawthorne, *Nathaniel Hawthorne and His Wife*, 1.75.

<sup>10</sup>Julian Hawthorne, *Nathaniel Hawthorne and His Wife*, 1.189.

servations from them; in his Italian Note-Book he mentions Soracte three times, but makes no connection between it and Horace. This is the more remarkable when one recalls that Longfellow, with whom he studied Horace, was peculiarly affected by the ninth ode of Horace's first Book, in which Soracte is so impressive a back-drop; and in fact there is apparently an echo of the final stanza of this ode in *The Marble Faun*<sup>11</sup>.

Hawthorne's reaction against the authority granted to codified literary theory was violently hostile. He makes one of his persons, a carver of wood, declare<sup>12</sup>:

... Let others do what they may with marble, and adopt what rules they choose. If I can produce my desired effect by painted wood, those rules are not for me, and I have a right to disregard them.

In another tale, *The New Adam* and Eve, he again expresses his dislike of inherited tradition<sup>13</sup>:

... Should he <the New Adam> fall short of good, even as far as we did, he has at least the freedom—no worthless one—to make errors for himself. And his literature, when the progress of centuries shall create it, will be no interminably repeated echo of our own poetry and reproduction of the images that were molded by our great fathers of song and fiction, but a melody never heard on earth, and intellectual forms unbreathed upon by our conceptions....

His son remarks that "he was the slave of no theory and of no emotion"<sup>14</sup>; Henry James declares that "he was not a man with a literary theory; he was guiltless of a system"<sup>15</sup>. One can, however, be an individualist without being a non-conformist, and this was Hawthorne's case. As Brownell acutely remarks<sup>16</sup>, "... Conformity to aught but his own traditions, which were conventional enough essentially, was as foreign to him as was the eccentricity that surrounded him...." Hawthorne was almost certainly in revolt against that ancient enemy of the Classics, the pseudo-classicism of the age of Anne. He clearly recognized the necessity of writing in harmony with rules. In the Preface to *The House of the Seven Gables*, he says of romance<sup>17</sup>: "... As a work of art, it must rigidly subject itself to laws...." Hawthorne is no literary anarchist. With fine irony he writes against the belief, current in his day, that the New America should have a brand-new literature<sup>18</sup>:

... And who was he?—who but the Master Genius for whom our country is looking anxiously into the mist of Time, as destined to fulfil the great mission of creating an American literature, hewing it, as it were, out of the unwrought granite of our intellectual quarries? From him, whether molded in the form of an epic poem or assuming a guise altogether new as the spirit itself may determine, we are to receive our first great original work, which shall do all that remains to be achieved for our glory among the nations....

Whether he continued his interest in Latin after his College days or not, it is certain that Hawthorne's years spent in Italy kindled to great heat his admiration for

the Rome of the past—for the sordid Rome of the middle of the nineteenth century he felt something akin to contempt. He has recorded for us in *The Marble Faun* his sentiments about the past of Rome<sup>19</sup>:

Side by side with the massiveness of the Roman past, all matters that we handle or dream of nowadays look evanescent and visionary alike.... In the blue distance rose Soracte and other heights, which have gleamed afar to our imaginations, but look scarcely real to our bodily eyes, because, being dreamed about so much, they have taken the aerial tints which belong only to a dream.... If we remember these mediaeval times, they look farther off than the Augustan age. The reason may be, that the old Roman literature survives, and creates for us an intimacy with the classic ages, which we have no means of forming with the subsequent ones.

Hawthorne had, it is true, prior to his years in Europe written to his publisher, James T. Fields, that, in his proposed renditions, for children, of classical legends he intended to substitute some tone other than the classic coldness, which he declared to be as repellent as the touch of marble<sup>20</sup>. There is, however, no hint of this feeling in his writing in Europe; he may perhaps have meant simply that the classic tone is repellent to children bred on romantic fairy-tales, or, more probably, he corrected while in Europe a mistaken impression about classic warmth.

The passages in which Hawthorne demonstrably has Horace in mind are few indeed. Aside from those which will be mentioned in the course of later discussion in this paper, the following may be noted. In *The Marble Faun* he writes<sup>21</sup>:

... Nor, if we would create an interest in the characters of our story, is it wise to suggest how Cicero's foot may have stepped on yonder stone, or how Horace was wont to stroll nearby, making his footsteps chime with the measure of the ode that was ringing in his mind. The very ghosts of that massive and stately epoch have so much density that the actual people of to-day seem the thinner of the two, and stand more ghostlike by the arches and columns, letting the rich sculpture be discerned through their ill-compacted substance.

Later in the same novel, he remarks<sup>22</sup>: "... Each of these old dames <beggars> looks as much like Horace's *Atra Cura* as can well be conceived...." Once in the *American Note-Books* he uses the tag *ore rotundo* from the *Ars Poetica*<sup>23</sup>. In *The Marble Faun*, again, the description of Kenyon's statue of Cleopatra may have been inspired by Horace's reluctant admiration for the Egyptian Queen as expressed in the thirty-seventh ode of the first book<sup>24</sup>. The following passage also bears a resemblance to the concluding stanzas of the ninth ode of the first book of Horace<sup>25</sup>:

... Some youths and maidens were running merry races across the open space <of the Coliseum, in the moonlight>, and playing at hide-and-seek a little way within the duskiess of the ground-tier of arches, whence now and then you could hear the half-shriek,

<sup>11</sup>The *Marble Faun* 183. The edition referred to is published by Houghton Mifflin. The last date of copyright is 1888.

<sup>12</sup>Mosses from an Old Manse 355 (Boston, Houghton Mifflin, 1882). One is reminded also of Vergil, *Aeneid* 6.847-850.

<sup>13</sup>Mosses from an Old Manse 300.

<sup>14</sup>Julian Hawthorne, Nathaniel Hawthorne and His Wife, 1.83.

<sup>15</sup>Henry James, Jr., *Hawthorne*, 4 (New York, Harper, 1879).

<sup>16</sup>W. C. Brownell, *American Prose Masters*, 76 (New York, Scribner, 1909). The italics are mine.

<sup>17</sup>The *House of the Seven Gables* 13 (Boston, Houghton Mifflin, 1883).

<sup>18</sup>Mosses from an Old Manse 79.

<sup>19</sup>The *Marble Faun* 21, 124, 195.

<sup>20</sup>A *Wonder Book* 10 (Boston, Houghton Mifflin, 1883).

<sup>21</sup>The *Marble Faun* 189-190.

<sup>22</sup>The *Marble Faun* 354. Compare Horace, *Carmina* 3.1.40 *Post equitem sedet atra cura*.

<sup>23</sup>*American Note-Books* 48 (Boston, Houghton Mifflin, 1870). The expression occurs in Horace, *Ars Poetica* 323.

<sup>24</sup>The *Marble Faun* 151-153.

<sup>25</sup>See note 11, above. Compare Horace, *Carmina* 1.9.21-24 *Nunc et latentis proditor intimo gratus puellae risus ab angulo pignusque dereptum lacertis aut digito male pertinaci*.

half-laugh of a frolicsome girl, whom the shades had betrayed into a young man's arms. . . .

Woodberry mentions and quotes from a letter which would appear to be reminiscent of Horace, or possibly of Vergil, from its use of the name Maecenas<sup>26</sup> (Woodberry is, however, doubtful whether Hawthorne is correctly reported):

... "Thus", wrote Hawthorne, "has this man <Park Benjamin, Editor of the American Monthly Magazine>, who would be considered a Maecenas, taken from a penniless writer material incomparably better than any his own brain can supply. . . ."

Of the principles enunciated by Horace that have to do with literary composition some find expression also in Hawthorne's volumes. Two facts should, however, be kept in view while one is considering these principles, first, that Hawthorne was not a professional critic, and, secondly, that it is not possible to assert that in each instance he derived his principles immediately from Horace. Part and parcel as they are of the heritage of English literature, one would be foolhardy to assert that Hawthorne in every instance was consciously recalling Horace. But, since Hawthorne had read Horace and occasionally showed reminiscences of him in his works, it seems reasonable to assume that he knew what classical literary theory is, and that he was profiting by it, whether or not he derived it consciously from Horace. With these facts in mind, let us now briefly consider in what ways Hawthorne echoes the dicta of Horace.

Hawthorne evidently accepted the time-honored dictum that the poet is a highly endowed person whose peculiar traits have been developed by training. In his romance, *Dr. Grimshawe's Secret*, one of his latest works, he describes the character of a promising boy as follows<sup>27</sup>:

... There were the rudiments of a poetic and imaginative mind within the boy, if its subsequent culture should be such as that delicate flower requires; a brooding habit taking outward things into itself and imbuing them with its own essence until, after they had lain there awhile, they assumed a relation both to truth and to himself, and became mediums to affect other minds with the magnetism of his own. . . .

He also accepts Horace's belief that this training should extend over a long period of time, and should consist both in study of the best books and in study of men. Before the year 1821, and many years before his first work appeared, he wrote to his mother<sup>28</sup>: "... How would you like some day to see a whole shelf full of books, written by your own son, with 'Hawthorne's Works' printed on their backs? . . ." As to the nature of the study required, he writes of the same boy mentioned above<sup>29</sup>:

... He showed, indeed, even before he began to read at all, an instinctive attraction towards books. . . . But the little boy had too quick a spirit of life to be in danger of becoming a bookworm himself. He had this side of the intellect, but his impulse would be to mix with

men, and catch something from their intercourse fresher than books could give him; though these would give him what they might.

In his description of *Dr. Grimshawe*, Hawthorne shows his appreciation of the need that the humanizing power of the Classics be exercised at an early age<sup>30</sup>:

... He himself <*Dr. Grimshawe*> must have had rigid and faithful instruction at an early period of life, though probably not in his boyhood. For, though the culture had been bestowed, his mind had been left in so singularly rough a state that it seemed as if the refinement of classical culture could not have been begun very early. . . . He evidently possessed in an unusual degree the sort of learning that refines other minds—the critical acquaintance with the great poets and historians of antiquity. . . .

Hawthorne himself was too one-sided in his development. He had an extensive acquaintance with books; but, as he once wrote to his classmate Longfellow<sup>31</sup>,

... I have another great difficulty in the lack of materials; for I have seen so little of the world that I have nothing but thin air to concoct my stories of, and it is not easy to give a life-like semblance to such shadowy stuff. Sometimes through a peephole I have caught a glimpse of the real world, and the two or three articles in which I have portrayed these glimpses please me better than the others. . . .

This lack of first-hand acquaintance with real life, a more extreme lack than is often met, caused Hawthorne to destroy a whole series of essays and tales similar to the *Mosses from an Old Manse*; and his sister-in-law, Miss Elizabeth Peabody, recalled that, according to Hawthorne's own statement to her, whenever he found on rereading anything he had written that it lacked the healthiness of nature, he felt as if he had been guilty of a lie<sup>32</sup>.

The two Horatian ideas that stand out in boldest relief in Hawthorne's work are, first, contempt for the artist who is able to produce some detail of a work, but cannot finish a whole, and, secondly, the dissatisfaction felt by true artists because their execution falls so far short of their ideal. The lowest of the artists, says Horace<sup>33</sup>, can form finger-nails and hair, but he is no more to be praised than a man is to be accounted handsome who has fine features, but whose nose is askew. In five places Hawthorne repeats this contempt<sup>34</sup>.

... On one slate grave-stone, of the Rev. Nath'l. Rogers, there was a portrait of that worthy, about a third of the size of life, carved in relief, with his cloak, band, and wig, in excellent preservation, all the buttons of his waistcoat being cut with great minuteness—the minister's nose being on a level with his cheeks. . . .

Twice in *The Marble Faun* he shows his scorn of artists with the failing that Horace condemns<sup>35</sup>. Hawthorne does not, however, wish to be considered an admirer of careless, unfinished work, but apparently feels that

<sup>26</sup>*Dr. Grimshawe's Secret* 37.

<sup>27</sup>George Edward Woodberry, *Nathaniel Hawthorne*, 74.

<sup>28</sup>Moncure D. Conway, *Life of Nathaniel Hawthorne*, 31 (New York, Scribner and Welford, 1890).

<sup>29</sup>Horace, *Ars Poetica* 31–37.

<sup>30</sup>American Note-Books 8.

<sup>31</sup>*The Marble Faun* 162–163: "... they were a body of very dexterous and capable artists, each of whom had probably given the delighted public a nude statue, or had won credit for even higher skill by the nice carving of button-holes, shoe-ties, coat-seams, shirt-bosoms, and other such graceful peculiarities of modern costume. . . ." On pages 140–141 Hawthorne's humor is directed at "the admiration which our artists get for their buttons and button-holes, their shoe-ties, their neckcloths—and these, at our present epoch of taste, make a large share of the renown. . . ."

<sup>26</sup>Woodberry, *Nathaniel Hawthorne*, 61 (see note 6, above). The latter may be dated about the year 1836.

<sup>27</sup>*Dr. Grimshawe's Secret* 109 (Boston, Houghton Mifflin, 1882). Compare Horace, *Ars Poetica* 408–415.

<sup>28</sup>George Parsons Lathrop, *A Study of Hawthorne*, 83 (see note 4, above).

<sup>29</sup>*Dr. Grimshawe's Secret* 37. Compare Horace, *Ars Poetica* 309–318.

one may carry the attitude of Horace too far, and misunderstand it<sup>36</sup>.

... There were several little appendages to this dress <of the image>, such as a fan, a pair of earrings, a chain about the neck, a watch in the bosom, and a ring upon the finger, all of which would have been deemed beneath the dignity of sculpture. They were put on, however, with as much taste as a lovely woman might have shown in her attire, and could therefore have shocked none but a judgment spoiled by artistic rules. Here, again, Hawthorne is obviously in revolt against the tendency in art which, like the pseudo-classic attitude in letters, requires that the artistic product follow the actual form, not the esthetic idea, of classical rules.

The second Horatian dictum, that the artistic product imperfectly represents the artistic concept, occurs several times in Hawthorne's writing. He mentions "that standard which no genius ever reached, his own severe conception"<sup>37</sup>. Again, he says in slightly different vein<sup>38</sup>,

... It would not be too much to affirm that every author has imagined and shaped out in his thought more and far better works than those which actually proceeded from his pen. ...

In *The Marble Faun* the sculptor Kenyon laments thus<sup>39</sup>:

... The inevitable period has come—for I have found it inevitable, in regard to all my works—when I look at what I fancied to be a statue, lacking only breath to make it live, and find it a mere lump of senseless stone into which I have not really succeeded in moulding the spiritual part of my idea. ...

Among the influences that helped to mold Hawthorne's sense of artistic values, which was so much stronger after his sojourn in Italy, one should not forget the sculptor William Wetmore Story, who is probably represented by Kenyon in *The Marble Faun*.

Hawthorne's method of composition also bears close resemblance to that which is advocated by Horace. His slowness to compose, for example, reminds one of Horace's injunction to do nothing *invita Minerva*<sup>40</sup>. Eleven years after his graduation from Bowdoin, he recorded among other resolutions one "to do nothing against one's genius"<sup>41</sup>. He found *The House of the Seven Gables* more difficult to write than *The Scarlet Letter*, because it was written in varying moods, whereas the earlier tale was of one somber color without relief, and he was obliged to await the coming of the mood proper to the particular part of the later novel that he was writing<sup>42</sup>. Mrs. Hawthorne in a letter to her mother thus describes his manner of working<sup>43</sup>:

<sup>36</sup>Mosses from an Old Manse 354.

<sup>37</sup>Twice-Told Tales 206 (Boston, Houghton Mifflin, 1882). Horace expresses this idea at some length in *Ars Poetica* 24-31, and the idea is implicit in his insistence upon fair-play in criticism, *Ars Poetica* 347-353.

<sup>38</sup>Mosses from an Old Manse 83.

<sup>39</sup>*The Marble Faun* 430-431. Compare Mosses from an Old Manse 516: "... Alas that the artist, whether in poetry, or whatever other material, may not content himself with the inward enjoyment of the beautiful, but must chase the flitting mystery beyond the verge of his ethereal domain, and crush its frail being in seizing it with a material grasp. ..."

<sup>40</sup>Horace, *Ars Poetica* 385.

<sup>41</sup>American Note-Books 17.

<sup>42</sup>George Parsons Lathrop, *A Study of Hawthorne*, 227 (see note 4, above): "I find the book requires more care and thought than 'The Scarlet Letter'; also I have to wait oftener for a mood. 'The Scarlet Letter' being all in one tone, I had only to get my pitch, and could then go on interminably. ..."

<sup>43</sup>Rose Hawthorne Lathrop, *Memories of Hawthorne*, 71-72 (Boston, Houghton Mifflin, 1897).

... He waits upon the light in such a purely simple way that I do not wonder at the perfection of each of his stories. Of several sketches, first one and then another come up to be clothed upon with language, after their own will and pleasure. It is real inspiration, and few are reverent and patient enough to wait for it as he does. ...

Hawthorne had also decided what literary material was suited to his strength<sup>44</sup>, and he clung to the style in which he could best write. The most recent of the critics of Hawthorne acutely says<sup>45</sup>:

Hawthorne's observation to Fields that he admired one kind of novel and wrote another is sign enough... of his recognition that a man must write the kind of books he can, not the kind he would. ...

His son remarks upon Hawthorne's certainty that his genius was leading him into the correct channel for him to pursue, an assurance that neither ancient nor modern criticism could force him to alter<sup>46</sup>. Hawthorne himself verifies this statement<sup>47</sup>:

... It is requisite for the ideal artist to possess a force of character that seems hardly compatible with its delicacy; he must keep his faith in himself while the incredulous world assails him with its utter disbelief; he must stand up against mankind and be his own sole disciple, both as respects his genius and the objects to which it is directed.

In this connection, it is interesting to note the parallel methods of expression used by Horace and Hawthorne in asserting their right to material that may have been used before; both employ the figure of a right-of-way across ground that others have made their own property. Horace insists that the writer does well to employ such material<sup>48</sup>; Hawthorne, in his Preface to *The House of the Seven Gables*, says<sup>49</sup>:

... He <the author> trusts not to be considered as unpardonably offending by laying out a street that infringes upon nobody's private rights, and appropriating a lot of land which had no visible owner, and building a house of materials long in use for constructing castles in the air. ...

Horace's warning to the artist that he should be concise in precept<sup>50</sup> is a command that most of the New England writers did not sufficiently heed. Hawthorne with the rest at times laid himself open to the charge of didacticism. For the most part, however, he let his story express its own moral, even as Horace did<sup>51</sup>. His "inveterate love of allegory"<sup>52</sup>, which he himself deplores, does at times detract from the reality of his

<sup>44</sup>Compare Horace, *Ars Poetica* 38-41 *Sumite materiam vestris qui scribitis aequam viribus, et versate diu quid ferre recusent, quid valeant umeri. Cui lecta potenter erit res nec facundia deseret hunc nec lucidus ordo.*

<sup>45</sup>Austin Warren, Nathaniel Hawthorne, lxvii (New York, American Book Company, 1934). This volume is one of an extremely valuable series known as the American Writers Series now being produced under the able editorship of Dr. Harry Hayden Clark, of the University of Wisconsin.

<sup>46</sup>Julian Hawthorne, *The Salem of Hawthorne*, 5-6, in *The Century Magazine* 28 (May, 1884). The same writer, in an article entitled Hawthorne's Philosophy, in *The Century Magazine* 32.85 (May, 1886), mentions his "delectable leishureliness—his imperial refusal to be in a hurry. ..." Brownell, *American Prose Masters*, 99 (see note 16, above), who is no hero-worshipper, sees in Hawthorne's "bland acceptance of his genius" an inheritance from the Calvinistic assurance of election; this, he believes, explains why Hawthorne preferred to let his genius lead him rather than to launch out into new channels.

<sup>47</sup>Mosses from an Old Manse 512.

<sup>48</sup>*Ars Poetica* 128-135.

<sup>49</sup>*The House of the Seven Gables* 15.

<sup>50</sup>Horace, *Ars Poetica* 335 *Quicquid praecipies, esto brevis. ...*

<sup>51</sup>Horace, *Ars Poetica* 343-344 *Omne tulit punctum, qui miscuit utile dulci, lectorem delectando pariterque monendo.*

<sup>52</sup>Mosses from an Old Manse 107.

tales. One should remember, however, that Hawthorne belonged to a period to which moralizing was not at all alien, and that he was primarily interested in the problem of sin and its effects upon human nature; it is not easy to see how one could write of such matters without drawing conclusions with more than a tinge of the didactic in them. He is as concise in precept as his theme allows. He himself justifies his didacticism thus<sup>53</sup>:

...The author has considered it hardly worth his while...relentlessly to impale the story with its moral as with an iron rod—or, rather, as by sticking a pin through a butterfly—thus at once depriving it of life, and causing it to stiffen in an ungainly and unnatural attitude. A high truth, indeed, fairly, finely, and skilfully wrought out, brightening at every step, and crowning the final development of a work of fiction, may add an artistic glory, but is never any truer, and seldom any more evident, at the last page than at the first.

In one aspect, Hawthorne's tales fall short of the pattern set by Horace for creative work: his characters do not speak in a manner natural to the individuals, but are too stilted and elegant. In view of this major defect, it is somewhat surprising to find him hailed as "essentially a dramatic genius," a tribute which does not in the least fit him<sup>54</sup>.

Horace expects that the writer will accept unbiassed criticism in the spirit in which it is given<sup>55</sup>, and Hawthorne does not fall short in this respect. He wrote to his friend Fields of the criticisms of *The House of the Seven Gables*<sup>56</sup>: "...I can better judge of the censure <than of the praise>, much of which is undoubtedly just; and I shall profit by it if I can..." In the same year (1851) he writes of E. P. Whipple's remarks about the book<sup>57</sup>:

Whipple's notices have done more than pleased me, for they have helped me to see my book. Much of the censure I recognize as just; I wish I could feel the praise to be so fully deserved....

There are a few passages which point to Hawthorne's acquaintance with classical critics other than Horace. Once he mentions "the missing treatises of Longinus, from which modern criticism might profit"<sup>58</sup>. Four passages are, perhaps, reminiscent of Aristotle's *Poetics*. The first is a warning to the writer to be sparing in his use of the marvellous<sup>59</sup>; the second laments the difficulty of making the romantic improbabilities of *The House of the Seven Gables* less glaring<sup>60</sup>; the third directly contradicts Aristotle's statement that beauty has a relation to size<sup>61</sup>; and the fourth mentions unity as the result of artistic arrangement<sup>62</sup>. Since, however, it cannot be shown that Hawthorne ever came into contact with the Aristotelian treatise, and since these ideas

were current in English literature, one cannot follow up such faint traces.

Hawthorne became acquainted with Horace while he was a student at Bowdoin; there is, however, apparent in his writing prior to his sojourn in Italy an occasional impatience with classic rules that leads one to suspect him to be viewing them through the distorted light cast upon them by the pseudo-classic writers, whose vogue in America had not yet entirely passed. His years in Italy opened his eyes to the real greatness of antiquity; and his contacts with ancient art and with enlightened modern artists corrected his conception of the classical rules and set them before him more nearly in their genuine importance.

WASHINGTON AND JEFFERSON  
COLLEGE,  
WASHINGTON, PENNSYLVANIA

JOHN PAUL PRITCHARD

### CICERO, TUSCULANAE DISPUTATIONES 2.39

Eloquere, eloquere, res Argivum proelio ut se sustinet.

Non potest ecfari tantum dictis quantum factis suppetit laboris<sup>1</sup>.

These verses are quoted by Cicero, pretty certainly from a lost play of Ennius<sup>1a</sup>. The warrior Eurypylus has been wounded in battle, and, finding that the surgeons are too busy to give him attention, he comes to the tent of Patroclus, where he hopes to secure assistance. But Patroclus is eager for news, and in the first of the verses quoted above he calls for a report from the field. The following sentence embodies the reply of Eurypylus. To this reply attention is here directed.

On metrical grounds, the emendation of *potest* to *potis* has met with some approval. But *potest* has the clear support of the manuscripts, and it has been pointed out that the metrical difficulty can be overcome by pronouncing *potest* as a monosyllable (i. e. *pot'st*)<sup>2</sup>.

If *potest* is read, it is necessary to interpret *ecfari* as a passive rather than as a deponent. All seem to agree that such use of the form is possible<sup>3</sup>, though Dougan<sup>4</sup>, in accepting the emendation *potis*, welcomes this change of text as a means of saving for *ecfari* its normal deponent force, which he thinks is required by the larger context.

<[In The Loeb Classical Library version of Cicero, *Tusculanae Disputationes* (1927), Mr. J. E. King notes that *laboris* here is an emendation made by Bentley. His own text, which follows the manuscripts, shows...*factis suppetit*. <PATROCLUS>—Laberis... Mr. King translates this last word by "See, you faint".

Bentley's emendation was accepted by Carl Meissner (Leipzig, Richter and Harrassowitz, 1873), by Raphael Kühner ("Editio Quinta Auctior et Emendatior", Hanover, Hahn, 1874), by Gustav Srofi, in his revision ("Achte Auflage") of Gustav Tischer's edition of the *Tusculanae* (Berlin, Weidmann, 1884), by Otto Heine ("Vierte, verbesserte Auflage" [Leipzig, Teubner, 1892]), and by Thomas Wilson Dougan (see note 4, below).

It is strange, to me, that for Professor Nutting "the clear support of the manuscripts..." was important for *potes* versus an "emendation", but that in the case of *laboris* versus *Laberis* the clear support of the manuscripts seemed negligible. C. K. >.

<sup>1a</sup>See J. Vahlen, *Ennianae Poesis Reliquiae*<sup>2</sup>, Scenica 169-171 (Leipzig, Teubner, 1903); Otto Ribbeck, *Tragicorum Romanorum Fragmenta*<sup>3</sup>, Q. Ennius, 323-324 (Leipzig, Teubner, 1897).

<sup>2</sup>On the textual problems of this verse see R. Kühner, M. Tullii Ciceronis *Tusculanarum Disputationum Libri Quinque* (Jena, Fr. Frommann, 1853), and M. Pohlenz, M. Tullii Ciceronis *Scripta Quae Manserunt Omnia*, Fasciculus 44, *Tusculanae Disputationes* (Leipzig, Teubner, 1918).

<sup>3</sup>Vahlen (see note 1a, above) cites examples from Varro, *De Lingua Latina* 6.53.

<sup>4</sup>Thomas Wilson Dougan, M. Tullii Ciceronis *Tusculanarum Disputationum Libri Quinque*, Volume I (Cambridge: At the University Press, 1905).

<sup>53</sup>The House of the Seven Gables 14-15.

<sup>54</sup>George Parsons Lathrop, *A Study of Hawthorne*, 36 (see note 4, above).

<sup>55</sup>Horace, *Ars Poetica* 438-452.

<sup>56</sup>James T. Fields, *Yesterdays With Authors*, 60 (see note 2, above).

<sup>57</sup>George Parsons Lathrop, *A Study of Hawthorne*, 234.

<sup>58</sup>Mosses from an Old Manse 553.

<sup>59</sup>The House of the Seven Gables 13. Compare Aristotle, *Poetics* 24.15-17.

<sup>60</sup>George Parsons Lathrop, *A Study of Hawthorne*, 228 (see note 4, above). Aristotle throughout the *Poetics* assumes that the story will generally be so old as to be traditional.

<sup>61</sup>Mosses from an Old Manse 507-508. Compare Aristotle, *Poetics* 7.8-10.

<sup>62</sup>The House of the Seven Gables 17-18. Compare Aristotle, *Poetics* 7.10 for the comparison of a plot to a living organism.

So far as I have seen, no one has yet called attention to a passage in Terence, Hecyra 415-417, which is so similar that it seems a possible reminiscence of the sentence here under discussion:

PARMENO.—Ain tu tibi hoc incommodum evenisse iter?

SOSIA.—Non hercle verbis, Parmeno, dici potest tantum quam re ipsa<sup>5</sup> navigare incommodumst.

Here we have *Non . . . verbis . . . dici potest*, whereas for Ennius the reading is *Non potest ecfari . . . dictis*. If Terence had Ennius in mind, his words *dici potest* certainly give strong support to the case for *potest ecfari* (passive) of the older poet<sup>6</sup>.

H. C. NUTTING

#### TACITUS, HISTORIAE 1.33.3-4

In Tacitus, *Historiae* 1.33.3-4 we read:

. . . Non expectandum ut compositis castris forum Otho invadat et prospectante Galba Capitolium adeat, dum egregius imperator cum fortibus amicis ianua ac limine tenus domum claudit, obsidionem nimirum toleraturus. Et praeclarum in servis auxilium si consensus tantae multitudinis. . . elanguescat.

After Otho was carried away by the conspirators to the praetorian camp, Galba did not know exactly what was happening. His advisers were not of one mind: some were for keeping within the palace, others for going out to meet the issue, whatever it might be. A part of the very sarcastic argument of the latter for venturing forth is quoted above.

In explaining the expression *obsidionem nimirum toleraturus* the commentators and the translators hold rather closely to Ciceronian use of the future participle. But, in view of another usage found with special frequency in Lucan, a more exact rendering may be possible. Speaking of Caesar quelling a mutiny and of the execution of the ringleaders, Lucan says (5.364-367):

Timuit saeva sub voce minantis  
volgus iners, unumque caput tam magna iuventus  
privatum factura timet, velut ensibus ipsis  
imperet, invito moturus milite ferrum.

The words *privatum factura* do not mean that the great force of soldiers was 'about to deprive' or 'planning to deprive' or 'destined to deprive' Caesar of his rank. The troops were thoroughly cowed. Lucan means simply to observe that they had it in their hands to put Caesar down. So used, the future participle takes on the force of 'able to deprive'.

This meaning fits very aptly in the sarcastic argument in Tacitus, *Historiae* 1.33.3-4 for venturing out of the palace to meet the issue in the open. The sense is, 'while the peerless Emperor with his valiant friends fortifies the palace at door and threshold, doubtless able to stand a siege!'

H. C. NUTTING

<sup>5</sup>This is emended by some to *reapse*.

<sup>6</sup>It may be noted in passing that the oldest manuscript of Terence presents not *tantum quam*, but *tantum quantum*. This gives clear parallelism with the passage from Ennius.

<sup>7</sup>For other examples see Lucan 4.16, 5.449, 6.231, 441, 9.718. So Martial 5.69.1. Compare Tacitus, *Annales* 1.15.2 (*suffecturi*).

<sup>8</sup>Such an expression as 'being in position to deprive', 'having it in its power to deprive' might convey Professor Nutting's idea. C. K. >

#### CAESAR, DE BELLO CIVILI 3.41.3

. . . Dyrrachium profectus est <Caesar>, sperans Pompeium aut Dyrrachium compelli aut ab eo intercludi posse, quod omnem commeatum totiusque belli apparatus eo contulisset; ut accidit. . .

As the text stands, this sentence seems a very awkward piece of writing. Caesar advances toward Dyrrachium, hoping either to force Pompey to withdraw to that city in order to protect his stores, or to cut him off from that base. The latter was the thing actually accomplished.

The *quod*-clause is naturally felt to belong to the first alternative (*Dyrrachium compelli*), but it is separated from it by the second alternative. At the same time it itself separates the closing words of the sentence (*ut accidit*) from the second alternative, to which they refer.

Rather serious difficulties are not infrequent in the text of the *De Bello Civili*. In these places Meusel is very ready with radical remedies. Here<sup>1</sup> he inserts *oppido* after *ab eo*, accepts the emendation *quo* for *quod*, and deletes *eo* farther along in the clause. He reads: . . . Dyrrachium profectus est <Caesar>, sperans Pompeium aut Dyrrachium compelli aut ab eo oppido intercludi posse, quo omnem commeatum totiusque belli apparatus contulisset; ut accidit.

Meusel's offhand fashion of rewriting Caesar will leave a doubt in the minds of some. In the present instance, it certainly is worth considering whether after all the manuscript reading is quite impossible.

The Doberenz-Dinter<sup>2</sup> edition makes the suggestion that the *quod*-clause may be so understood as to apply to both alternatives. This would seem to mean that it supplies a reason that might induce Pompey to retire to Dyrrachium, and that also would explain Caesar's wish to cut him off from that city<sup>3</sup>; the mood of the verb is accommodated to the first application rather than to the second<sup>4</sup>.

This suggestion helps somewhat. It seems possible that even Caesar, writing when he was weary or in haste, set down such a muddled sentence, not stopping to polish it into his accustomed clarity of expression.

In judging this question, it would be well to find out whether there are any other passages of this sort in the *De Bello Civili*. In this connection 3.77.1 may be mentioned: Postero die Caesar, similiter praemissis prima nocte impedimentis, de quarta vigilia ipse egreditur ut, si qua esset imposita dimicandi necessitas, subitum casum expedito exercitu subiret. . . Here the *ut*-clause logically belongs with the ablative absolute, as may be seen by rearranging the sentence: Postero die Caesar similiter praemissis prima nocte impedimentis, ut, si qua esset imposita dimicandi necessitas, subitum casum expedito exercitu subiret, de quarta vigilia ipse egreditur<sup>5</sup>.

H. C. NUTTING

<sup>1</sup>C. Iulii Caesaris Commentarii De Bello Civili, Von F. Kraner und F. Hofmann, Elfte Vollständig Umgearbeitete Auflage von H. Meusel (Berlin, Weidmann, 1906).

<sup>2</sup>C. Iulii Caesaris Commentarii De Bello Civili, Von A. Doberenz, Fünfte Auflage von G. B. Dinter (Leipzig, Teubner, 1884).

<sup>3</sup>Doberenz-Dinter do not go into detail on this point. A somewhat different expansion is made by Bernadotte Perrin, *Caesar's Civil War* (Boston, Heath, 1882).

<sup>4</sup>Compare *spectans quod* and the indicative in 3.43.2.

<sup>5</sup>That Caesar did not choose the order of the text to avoid using the form *egreditur* at the end of the sentence is shown by the employment of *ex oppido egreditur* in that position in *De Bello Gallico* 7.84.1.

## CAESAR, DE BELLO GALLICO 5.25.2

... Huic < = Tasgetio > Caesar pro eius virtute atque in se benevolentia, quod in omnibus bellis singulari eius opera fuerat usus, maiorum locum restituerat. . . .

In this passage the form *fuerat usus* has attracted much attention, but the more interesting problem presented in the syntax of *singulari eius opera* is passed over in silence by the editors generally. It was only after referring to many volumes that I reached a correct version: 'had found his services of unusual value. . . .'

This rendering is something more than a mere paraphrase. That *fuerat usus* does not mean 'had used' is clear for the reason that it would be absurd to say that Caesar rewarded a man because he (Caesar) had used that man's services<sup>1a</sup>. The verb *utor* is capable of several meanings, among them 'experience', 'find'. It may even mean 'suffer', as in Terence, Hecyra 423 Ita usque adversa tempestate usi sumus<sup>1b</sup>. These are the words of a traveller by sea who is telling of the hardships of a journey just completed: 'so all the way' he says, 'did we experience bad weather'. In like manner, Caesar, De Bello Civili 3.15.4 says, . . . atque etiam uno tempore accidit ut difficilioribus usi tempestatibus ex pellibus quibus erant textae naves nocturnum excipere rorem cogerentur. . . .

Furthermore, in addition to its objective ablative, the verb *utor* not infrequently has also a predicate ablative<sup>2</sup>. There is a simple illustration in Caesar, De Bello Civili 3.95.5: . . . protinusque omnes, ducibus usi centurionibus tribunisque militum, in altissimos montis, qui ad castra pertinebant, confugerunt. Here all are said to have fled, 'using as leaders' the centurions and the military tribunes<sup>3</sup>.

The passage under discussion in this note employs the verb *utor* in a special sense, and its predicate ablative is an adjective; Caesar 'had found his support outstanding'. There are two very similar expressions in Caesar, De Bello Civili 3.59.1 . . . quorum opera Caesar omnibus Gallicis bellis optima fortissimaque erat usus . . . , and De Bello Gallico 7.76.1 Huius opera Commi, ut antea demonstravimus, fideli atque utili superioribus annis erat usus in Britannia Caesar. . . .

The first of these instances is specially satisfactory because the persons referred at the end behaved dishonestly and disappointed Caesar. *Once* he had found their services all that could be desired; now they have shown themselves in another light.

H. C. NUTTING

<sup>1a</sup>H. W. Johnston and F. W. Sanford, Caesar, Gallic War, Books I-V (Boston, Benj. H. Sanborn and Co., 1906). With the help of the Vocabulary, a like rendering may be worked out from the note in Caesar's Gallic War, by H. F. Towle and P. R. Jenks (Boston, Heath, 1903).

<sup>1b</sup>As long ago as 1908 T. Rice Holmes gave the following rendering, "for in all his campaigns he had found his services exceptionally valuable. . . ." (Caesar's Commentaries on the Gallic War Translated into English [London, Macmillan, 1908]). C. K. >

<sup>2a</sup>I am utterly unable to see the absurdity. Would any politician see the absurdity? C. K. >

<sup>2b</sup>There is grim humor here. This humor gives to *usi sumus* its special implication here. Commonly, I think, one finds *utor*, in this use, employed with a secondary object that denotes something desirable: compare e. g. *eo amico ego usus sum*. C. K. >

<sup>3</sup>See my article on the Latin Ablative as an Objective Case, University of California Publications in Classical Philology 10 (1930), 193-202.

<sup>4</sup>Compare De Bello Gallico 7.77.11; De Bello Civili 3.105.1.

## CLASSICAL ARTICLES IN NON-CLASSICAL PERIODICALS

## IV

The Saturday Review of Literature—January 26, Review, mildly favorable, by Basil Davenport, of Helena Carus, Artemis, Fare Thee Well [a novel based on the episode of Diotima in Plato's Symposium]; February 9, Butler and the "Odyssey", Edward D. Perry [a letter to the editor referring briefly to a meeting between the writer and Samuel Butler at Taormina in June, 1901]; March 9, Herodotus and Lice, F. A. Spencer [a brief letter correcting a statement made by J. B. S. Haldane in the issue of February 9, in the course of a review of Hans Zinsser, Rats, Lice and History].

School and Society—January 5, The College and Alexandria, Gordon K. Chalmers [the first part of this presidential address contains a well expressed summary of the spirit and the results of Greek Alexandrian scholarship]; March 2, Review, favorable, by William McAndrew, of Wilton W. Blancké, General Principles of Language and Introduction to its Study.

The Times Literary Supplement (London)—January 3, "The Platonic Legend", Warner Fite [a letter to the editor taking exception to a criticism made in the issue of November 29 in the course of a review of Mr. Fite's book, The Platonic Legend]; January 10, "The Platonic Legend", A. E. Taylor [a brief letter referring to remarks made by Mr. Warner Fite in his letter mentioned above]; Magna Est Veritas, E. H. Blakeney [a brief letter stating that "the title assigned to Members' Prize for Latin Essay at Cambridge" should read Magna est Veritas et Praevalet (not Praevalebit): this is the Latin version of I Esdras]; January 17, Review, critically unfavorable, of J. P. V. D. Balsdon, The Emperor Gaius (Caligula); Review, generally favorable, of J. W. H. Atkins, Literary Criticism in Antiquity (two volumes), and of T. R. Henn, Longinus and English Criticism; Brief Review, favorable, of J. C. Stewart, Covert on Helicon: Verses and Translations <from Latin and Greek>; January 24, Review, favorable, of Talbot Mundy, Tros of Samothrace [an historical novel]; Brief review, favorable, of E. H. Warmington, Greek Geography; Brief review, qualifiedly favorable, of Dionysius the Areopagite, The Celestial Hierarchies, Translated from the Greek by the Editors of "The Shrine of Wisdom"; January 31, Review, generally favorable, of Adeline B. Hawes, Citizens of Long Ago: Essays on Life and Letters in the Roman Empire; February 7, Review, favorable, of John W. Spargo, Virgil the Necromancer: Studies in Virgilian Legends; Brief review, uncritical, of William L. Westermann and Elizabeth S. Hasenoehr, Zenon Papyri: Business Papers of the Third Century B. C., Dealing with Palestine and Egypt, Volume I; Brief review, generally favorable, of Theodor Haecker, Virgil, Father of the West (translated by A. W. Wheen); Brief review, generally unfavorable, of Otto Kiefer, Sexual Life in Ancient Rome; February 14, Review, favorable, of Sir J. G. Frazer, Creation and Evolution in

Primitive Cosmogonies, and Other Pieces; Review, qualifiedly favorable, of E. Keble Chatterton, Sailing Models, Ancient and Modern; Review, favorable, of P. S. Allen, Erasmus: Lectures and Wayfaring Sketches, and of Stefan Zweig, Erasmus (translated by Eden Paul and Cedar Paul); Brief review, qualifiedly favorable, of F. H. Hayward, Marcus Aurelius, A Saviour of Men, Sixteenth Emperor of Rome; February 21, Review, qualifiedly favorable, of George R. Hamilton (Editor), The Greek Portrait: An Anthology of English Verse Translations from the Greek Poets (Homer to Meleager); Brief review, uncritical, of T. V. Smith, Philosophers Speak for Themselves: Guides and Readings for Greek, Roman, and Early Christian Philosophy; Brief review, favorable, of G. M. Bounphrey, Along the Roman Roads <of England>; February 28, Review, generally favorable, of H. A. L. Fisher, A History of Europe, Volume I; Review, favorable, of Sir Robert Mond and Oliver H. Myers, The Bucheum, With Chapters by T. J. C. Baly, D. B. Harden, J. W. Jackson, G. Mattha, and Alan W. Shorter, and the Hieroglyphic Inscriptions Edited by H. W. Fairman (three volumes); Brief review, very favorable, of J. H. Baxter and Charles Johnson, With the Assistance of Phyllis Abraham, Medieval Latin Word-List, From British and Irish Sources; Brief review, very favorable, of John Wordsworth and Henry J. White, Novum Testamentum Domini Nostri Iesu Christi Latine Secundum Editionem Hieronymi, Ad Codicum Manuscriptorum Fidem, Part II, Fascicle IV: Epistula ad Galatas, Epistula ad Ephesios; Brief review, favorable, of A. V. Valentine-Richards, The Text of Acts in Codex 614 (Tisch. 137) and Its Allies, Edited, With an Introduction, by J. M. Creed; March 7, Review, generally favorable, of Raymond H. Coon, William Warde Fowler: An Oxford Humanist; Review, generally favorable, of T. A. Sinclair, A History of Classical Greek Literature from Homer to Aristotle; Brief review, favorable, of H. J. M. Milne, Greek Shorthand Manuals: Syllabary and Commentary, Edited from Papyri and Waxed Tablets in the British Museum and from the Antinoë Papyri in the Possession of the Egypt Exploration Society; Brief review, favorable, of Grace H. Turnbull, The Essence of Plotinus: Extracts from the Six Enneads and Porphyry's Life of Plotinus, Based on the Translation by Stephen Mackenna; March 14, Review, qualifiedly favorable, of Frank B. Marsh, A History of the Roman World from 146 to 30 B. C.; Homer's Unharvested Sea, Jack Lindsay [a letter to the editor suggesting that the Homeric epithet *ἀρπύγες* "is an instance of traditional diction inherited from Egypt"]; March 21, Brief review, mildly favorable, of Albert M. Hyamson, Judas Maccabaeus: The Hammer of God.

WESLEYAN UNIVERSITY,  
MIDDLETOWN, CONNECTICUT

JOHN W. SPAETH, JR.

# V

The American Historical Review—April, Review, very favorable, by Clinton W. Keyes, of C. Bradford

Welles, Royal Correspondence in the Hellenistic Period: A Study in Greek Epigraphy; Review, favorable and interpretive, by Allan Chester Johnson, of Arthur E. R. Boak, Papyri from Tebtunis, Part I; Shorter notice, favorable, by Jakob A. O. Larsen, of Benjamin Dean Meritt and Allen Brown West, The Athenian Assessment of 425 B. C.; Shorter notice, favorable, by A. E. R. Boak, of N. Lewis, L'Industrie du Papyrus dans l'Égypte Gréco-Romaine; Shorter notice, qualifiedly favorable, by Salo W. Baron, of Jacob de Haas, History of Palestine: The Last Two Thousand Years; July, Review, generally favorable, by Allen B. West, of Paul Cloché, La Politique Étrangère d'Athènes de 404 à 338 avant Jésus-Christ; Review, favorable, by Frank Burr Marsh, of The Cambridge Ancient History, Volume X: The Augustan Empire, 44 B. C.—A. D. 70, Edited by S. A. Cook, F. E. Adcock, and M. P. Charlesworth, and of Volume of Plates IV, Prepared by C. T. Seltman; Review, summarizing, by Robert Samuel Rogers, of A. Poidebard, La Trace de Rome dans le Désert de Syrie, le Limes de Trajan à la Conquête Arabe: Recherches Aériennes, 1925–1932; Shorter notice, favorable, by George A. Barton, of V. Gordon Childe, New Light on the Most Ancient East: The Oriental Prelude to European Prehistory; Shorter notice, summarizing, by Harold N. Fowler, of The Excavations at Dura-Europos: Preliminary Report of Fifth Season of Work, October, 1931–March, 1932, Edited by M. I. Rostovtzeff.

The American Journal of Semitic Languages and Literatures—April, The Oriental Institute Archaeological Report on the Near East, Prepared with the Co-operation of Professor James H. Breasted, Fourth Quarter, 1934, by Neilson C. Debevoise; July, The Oriental Institute Archaeological Report on the Near East, Prepared with the Co-operation of Professor James H. Breasted [with one map].

American Philosophical Society Proceedings—Volume LXXV, Number 4, 1935, Some Fragments of the Oldest Beatty Papyrus in the Michigan Collection, Henry A. Sanders ["... I have also dated it <i. e. the Beatty Papyrus of Numbers and Deuteronomy to which the fragments at the University of Michigan belong> around the year A. D. 200..."] This article contains "The Text of the Fragments".

Anglican Theological Review—April, Review, favorable, by Frederick C. Grant, of The Cambridge Ancient History, Volume X: The Augustan Empire, 44 B. C.—A. D. 70, Edited by S. A. Cook, F. E. Adcock, and M. P. Charlesworth, and of Fourth Volume of Plates, Prepared by C. T. Seltman; July, Review, favorable, by Frederick C. Grant, of Novum Testamentum Graece, Secundum Textum Westcott-Hortianum: Euangelium Secundum Marcum, Edited by S. C. E. Legg.

WESLEYAN UNIVERSITY,  
MIDDLETOWN, CONNECTICUT

ADOLPH F. PAULI